

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-27 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10 and 19 being the independent claims. Based on the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 10, 11, 14-16, 19, 20 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 20050256590 (hereinafter referred to as “Choi”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,539 (hereinafter referred to as “Yamamoto”). Claims 3, 4, 12, 13, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Choi in view of Yamamoto and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 20040122930 (hereinafter referred to as “Pasternak”). Claims 8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Choi in view of Yamamoto and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 20040110472 (hereinafter referred to as “Witkowski”). Claims 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Choi in view of Yamamoto and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,315,711 (hereinafter referred to as “Barone”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections since Choi, Yamamoto, Pasternak, Witkowski and Barone, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of independent claims 1, 10 and 19 (and their dependent claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27) for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 include a similar feature of authenticating a user at the media center to determine a user interface and an execution environment for the device.

The Examiner points to Choi (step 560 and step 570 in Figure 5A) to teach this feature.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner that Choi teaches or suggests this feature as claimed by the present invention.

Text describing step 560 of Choi states: “In the case where the remote control data is transmitted to the remote controller **50** in a wired manner, the data is transmitted through the second interface unit **34** connected to the remote controller **50** in a wired manner at step **S560**.” (See, paragraph [0034], lines 15-19). Text describing step 570 of Choi states: “The remote controller **50** receives the transmitted data through the terminal **51** at step **S570** . . .” (See, paragraph [0034], lines 19 and 20). Thus, step 560 of Choi describes how data is transmitted to the remote controller in a wired manner. Step 570 of Choi describes how the remote controller receives transmitted data. Neither of these steps suggests nor describes the similar feature of independent claims 1, 10 and 19 of authenticating a user at the media center to determine a user interface and an execution environment for the device. A careful review of Choi, Yamamoto, Pasternak, Witkowski and Barone failed to disclose this feature. Accordingly, Choi, Yamamoto, Pasternak, Witkowski and Barone, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest every feature of independent claims 1, 10 and 19 (and their dependent claims 2-9, 11-18 and 20-27). Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**INVITATION FOR A TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned, Molly A. McCall, at (703) 633-3311 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: June 9, 2006

/Molly A. McCall/Reg. No. 46,126

Molly A. McCall  
(703) 633-3311

P18176 Reply to Non-Final OA

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:	
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
On: <u>6/9/2006</u>	
Signature: <u>Julie Dussault</u>	<u>6/9/2006</u>
Julie Dussault	Date